

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the May 3, 2006 Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected.

***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the May 3, 2006 Office Action, the applicants have amended claim 1, cancelled claim 3, and added new claim 13. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ishibashi et al. (US 5,202,281). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Newly amended claim 1 now recites that a dopant is infused in at least a portion of the thin portion that is immediately adjacent to the at least one through hole. In addition, newly added claim 13 recites that the dopant is infused in the entire thin portion of the semiconductor substrate. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification (see, for example, Paragraphs 0077 to 0081 and Figs. 2A to 2C).

The applicants respectfully submit that the semiconductor device now recited in the claims is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Ishibashi reference. As noted by the Examiner, the Ishibashi reference discloses a semiconductor device in which a portion of the thin portion of a semiconductor substrate is infused with a dopant, and a through hole is formed in the thin portion. However, the doped portion of the thin portion in the Ishibashi reference is not immediately adjacent to the through hole, but rather far removed from the through hole. In addition, only one small portion of the thin portion is doped in the Ishibashi reference, and not the entire thin portion.

Clearly, the structure recited in claims 1 and 13 is not disclosed or suggested by the Ishibashi reference, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element

*d<sup>o</sup> not ent<sup>r</sup>*

*O:N.*